UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,443	07/24/2003	Michael Hogan	2002P12271US01	9636

7590   07/25/2007

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER
COUGHLAN, PETER D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2129	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/626,443	HOGAN, MICHAEL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Peter Coughlan	2129

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 July 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>7/24/07</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/5/04</u>.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1.   Claims 1-45 are pending in this application.

Specification Objections

2.   Claims 1, 43, 44, 45 state the existence of 'expert knowledge.' The

specification is silent in describing what kind of 'expert knowledge is employed

within the specification. There are numerous methods which this can be but the

specification describes none.

35 USC § 101

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine,
> manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful
> improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for nonstatutory subject

matter. The computer system must set forth a practical application of that § 101

judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175

USPQ at 676-77. The invention is ineligible because it has not been limited to a

<u>substantial practical application</u>. The invention translate source information into

target information which is an abstract concept. How this translation is to be

employed is lacking. The result has to be a practical application. Please see the

interim guidelines for examination of patent applications for patent subject matter

eligibility published November 22, 2005 in the official gazette.

In determining whether the claim is for a "practical application," the focus

is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful,

tangible and concrete, but rather that the <u>final result</u> achieved by the claimed

invention is "useful, tangible and concrete." If the claim is directed to a practical

application of the § 101 judicial exception producing a result tied to the physical

world that does not preempt the judicial exception, then the claim meets the

statutory requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Is this translation to be used in the process of refining ore, generating a

marketing program, or online teaching methods? If so then no such

applications have been claimed.

The invention must be for a practical application and either:

1) specify transforming (physical thing) or

2) have the FINAL RESULT (not the steps) achieve or produce a

useful (specific, substantial, AND credible),

concrete (substantially repeatable/ non-unpredictable), AND

tangible (real world/ non-abstract) result.

A claim that is so broad that it reads on both statutory and non-statutory subject

matter, must be amended, <u>and if the specification discloses a practical</u>

application but the claim is broader than the disclosure such that it does not
require the practical application, then the claim must be amended.

Claims that recite a purpose or function in abstract terms is lacking a
practical application. There must be a result that is a practical application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102
that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office
action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section
122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or
(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before
the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under
the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an
application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-8, 12, 14-15, 18-20, 23-27, 43-45 are rejected under 35
U.S.C. 102(e) (hereinafter referred to as **Jayaram**) being anticipated by Jayaram,
U. S. Patent 6996589.

Claim 1

Jayaram anticipates obtaining information from one or more sources
(**Jayaram,** C3:16-32; 'Obtaining information from one or more sources' of
applicant is equivalent to 'receive or pull source data' of Jayaram.); applying a
first plurality of pattern matching rules to the information to obtain a first

transformed version of the information, the first plurality of pattern matching rules based on expert knowledge about a first plurality of patterns in the information(**Jayaram,** C3:16-32, abstract; 'Pattern matching rules' of applicant is equivalent to 'mapping instructions' of Jayaram. 'Expert knowledge' of applicant is equivalent to 'specifications' of Jayaram.); transforming the information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the information, the user input obtained via a graphical user interface generated based on a second plurality of pattern matching rules, the second plurality of pattern matching rules based on expert knowledge about a second plurality of patterns in the information (**Jayaram,** C13:13-47, C3:16-32; 'User input via a graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'graphical user interface' of Jayaram. 'Second plurality of pattern matching rules' of applicant is equivalent to 'target schema specifications' of Jayaram.); and expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed version in a destination system. (**Jayaram,** C3:16-32, C13:23-47; 'Expressing ... first and second transformed version' of applicant is equivalent to 'upload a resulting set of data into the target database' of Jayaram. Jayaram allows the data to be converted by either rules or by the interface.)

Claim 2

Jayaram anticipates converting the information into a common format. (**Jayaram,** C11:15-55; One example of a 'common format' of applicant is 'XML' of Jayaram.)

Claim 3

Jayaram anticipates converting the information into a user-definable

syntax. (**Jayaram,** C11:15-55; 'User definable syntax' of applicant is equivalent

to 'configurable mapping language' of Jayaram.)

Claim 4

Jayaram anticipates converting the information into XML. (**Jayaram,**

C11:15-55; One example of a 'XML' of applicant is 'XML' of Jayaram.)

Claim 5

Jayaram anticipates importing the first transformed version into the

destination system. (**Jayaram,** C3:16-32, C13:23-47; 'Importing the first

transformed version' of applicant is equivalent to 'upload a resulting set of data

into the target database' of Jayaram. Jayaram allows the data to be converted by

rules.)

Claim 6

Jayaram anticipates importing the second transformed version into the

destination system. (**Jayaram,** C3:16-32, C13:23-47; 'Importing the second

transformed version' of applicant is equivalent to 'upload a resulting set of data

into the target database' of Jayaram. Jayaram allows the data to be converted by

the interface.)

Claim 7

Jayaram anticipates parsing the information.(**Jayaram,** C4:34-38; 'Parsing

the information' of applicant is equivalent to 'parses a set of mapping instructions'

of Jayaram.)

Claim 8

Jayaram anticipates expressing the information in an XML syntax.

(**Jayaram,** C11:15-55; One example of a 'XML' of applicant is 'XML' of

Jayaram.)

Claim 12

Jayaram anticipates generating a plurality of options for translating an

element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47; 'Options' of applicant is

equivalent to 'commands' of Jayaram.)

Claim 14

Jayaram anticipates creating graphical user interface elements for

presenting a plurality of options for translating an element of the information.

(**Jayaram,** C13:1-47; 'Options' of applicant is equivalent to 'commands' of

Jayaram. 'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'GUI' of Jayaram.

Jayaram illustrates that instructions may be entered by the GUI.)

Claim 15

Jayaram anticipates presenting a plurality of options for translating an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47; 'Presenting a plurality of options of applicant is equivalent to 'constructs in a selectable list' of Jayaram.)

Claim 18

Jayaram anticipates presenting in the graphical user interface a plurality of options for translating an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47; 'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'GUI' of Jayaram.)

Claim 19

Jayaram anticipates receiving a user-selected option from a plurality of options for translating an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47; 'Translating an element of the information' of applicant is equivalent to 'the GUI may further include a mapping language parser to ensure that any mapping dependency constraints are fulfilled' of Jayaram.)

Claim 20

Jayaram anticipates receiving input relating to an element of the information from a user. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47; 'Receiving input' of applicant is the function of the GUI's of Jayaram.)

Claim 23

Jayaram anticipates tracking received user input for translating an element

of the information. (**Jayaram,** C21:34-52; 'Tracking' of applicant is equivalent to

'tracking are published' of Jayaram.)

Claim 24

Jayaram anticipates providing an audit trail of user input relating to a

translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C21:34-52; 'Providing an

audit trail' of applicant is equivalent to 'tracking are published' of Jayaram. This is

due to the specification 'user input can be tracked, thereby providing an audit trial

of user input.')

Claim 25

Jayaram anticipates providing an audit trail of the user input. (**Jayaram,**

C21:34-52; 'Providing an audit trail' of applicant is disclosed by 'tracking are

published through a report' of Jayaram.)

Claim 26

Jayaram anticipates repeating said applying activity. (**Jayaram,** Figure 9;

'Repeating said applying activity' of applicant is equivalent to the 'fail' arrow from

'business requirement compliance check' of Jayaram.)

Claim 27

Jayaram anticipates repeating said transforming activity. (**Jayaram,** Figure

9; 'Repeating said transforming activity' of applicant is equivalent to 'the 'fail'

arrow from the 'database attribute compliance check' of Jayaram.)

Claim 43

Jayaram anticipates obtaining information from one or more

sources(**Jayaram,** C3:16-32; 'Obtaining information from one or more sources' of

applicant is equivalent to 'receive or pull source data' of Jayaram.); applying a

first plurality of pattern matching rules to the information to obtain a first

transformed version of the information, the first plurality of pattern matching rules

based on expert knowledge about a first plurality of patterns in the

information(**Jayaram,** C3:16-32, abstract; 'Pattern matching rules' of applicant is

equivalent to 'mapping instructions' of Jayaram. 'Expert knowledge' of applicant

is equivalent to 'specifications' of Jayaram.); transforming the information using

user input to obtain a second transformed version of the information, the user

input obtained via a graphical user interface generated based on a second

plurality of pattern matching rules, the second plurality of pattern matching rules

based on expert knowledge about a second plurality of patterns in the

information(**Jayaram,** C13:13-47, C3:16-32; 'User input via a graphical user

interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'graphical user interface' of Jayaram.

'Second plurality of pattern matching rules' of applicant is equivalent to 'target

schema specifications' of Jayaram.); and expressing the first transformed version

and the second transformed version in a destination system. (**Jayaram,** C3:16-

32, C13:23-47; 'Expressing ... first and second transformed version' of applicant

is equivalent to 'upload a resulting set of data into the target database' of

Jayaram. Jayaram allows the data to be converted by either rules or by the

interface.)

Claim 44

Jayaram anticipates means for obtaining information from one or more

sources(**Jayaram,** C3:16-32; 'Obtaining information from one or more sources' of

applicant is equivalent to 'receive or pull source data' of Jayaram.); means for

applying a first plurality of pattern matching rules to the information to obtain a

first transformed version of the information, the first plurality of pattern matching

rules based on expert knowledge about a first plurality of patterns in the

information(**Jayaram,** C3:16-32, abstract; 'Pattern matching rules' of applicant is

equivalent to 'mapping instructions' of Jayaram. 'Expert knowledge' of applicant

is equivalent to 'specifications' of Jayaram.); means for transforming the

information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the

information, the user input obtained via a graphical user interface generated

based on a second plurality of pattern matching rules, the second plurality of

pattern matching rules based on expert knowledge about a second plurality of

patterns in the information(**Jayaram,** C13:13-47, C3:16-32; 'User input via a

graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'graphical user interface' of

Jayaram. 'Second plurality of pattern matching rules' of applicant is equivalent to

'target schema specifications' of Jayaram.); and means for expressing the first

transformed version and the second transformed version in a destination system. (**Jayaram,** C3:16-32, C13:23-47; 'Expressing ... first and second transformed version' of applicant is equivalent to 'upload a resulting set of data into the target database' of Jayaram. Jayaram allows the data to be converted by either rules or by the interface.)

Claim 45

Jayaram anticipates obtaining information from one or more sources(**Jayaram,** C3:16-32; 'Obtaining information from one or more sources' of applicant is equivalent to 'receive or pull source data' of Jayaram.); applying a first plurality of pattern matching rules to at least a first portion of the information to obtain a first transformed version of the information, the first plurality of pattern matching rules based on expert knowledge about a first plurality of patterns in the information(**Jayaram,** C3:16-32, abstract; 'Pattern matching rules' of applicant is equivalent to 'mapping instructions' of Jayaram. 'Expert knowledge' of applicant is equivalent to 'specifications' of Jayaram.); transforming at least a second portion of the information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the information, the user input obtained via a graphical user interface generated based on a second plurality of pattern matching rules, the second plurality of pattern matching rules based on expert knowledge about a second plurality of patterns in the information(**Jayaram,** C13:13-47, C3:16-32; 'User input via a graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'graphical user interface' of Jayaram. 'Second plurality of pattern matching rules' of applicant is

equivalent to 'target schema specifications' of Jayaram.); and expressing the first

transformed version and the second transformed version in a destination system.

(**Jayaram,** C3:16-32, C13:23-47; 'Expressing ... first and second transformed

version' of applicant is equivalent to 'upload a resulting set of data into the target

database' of Jayaram. Jayaram allows the data to be converted by either rules or

by the interface.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
> disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the
> prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not
> be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-11, 13, 35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Jayaram as set forth above, in view of Moore. (U. S. Patent

Publication 20010056429, referred to as **Moore**)

Claim 9

Jayaram does not teach applying XSLT transforms to the information.

Moore teaches applying XSLT transforms to the information. (**Moore,**

¶0291; 'XSLT transform' of applicant is equivalent to 'XSLT as a scripting

language' of Moore.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill

in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram

by introducing XSLT as taught by Moore to apply XSLT transforms to the

information.

For the purpose of using standard information technologies such as XSLT.

Claim 10

Jayaram does not teach applying XSLT transforms to the information and

generating DHTML.

Moore teaches applying XSLT transforms to the information and

generating DHTML. (**Moore,** ¶0291; 'XSLT transform' of applicant is equivalent to

'XSLT as a scripting language' of Moore. 'Generating DHTML' of applicant is

equivalent to using as a presentation language of DHTML of Moore.) It would

have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by applying XSLT to

DHTML as taught by Moore to apply XSLT transforms to the information and

generating DHTML.

For the purpose of generating a interface.

Claim 11

Jayaram does not teach generating DHTML encoding a plurality of options for translating an element of the information.

Moore teaches generating DHTML encoding a plurality of options for translating an element of the information. (**Moore**, ¶0291; 'Generating DHTML' of applicant is equivalent to using as a presentation language of DHTML of Moore. A 'presentation language' of Moore is equivalent to 'translating an element of the information' of applicant.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by using DHTML abilities as taught by Moore to generate DHTML encoding a plurality of options for translating an element of the information.

For the purpose of having a dynamic interface.

Claim 13

Jayaram does not teach interpreting a plurality of options for translating an element of the information using DHTML logic.

Moore teaches interpreting a plurality of options for translating an element of the information using DHTML logic. (**Moore**, ¶0291; 'Interpreting' of applicant is the presentation language function. This is in combination with Jayaram which discloses a GUI.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by resulting in DHTML logic as taught by Moore to interpret a plurality of options for translating an element of the information using DHTML logic.

For the purpose of using industrial standard code thus reducing interaction errors.

Claim 35

Jayaram does not teach wherein XSLT is employed to translate the information.

Moore teaches wherein XSLT is employed to translate the information. (**Moore,** ¶0291; 'XSLT transform' of applicant is equivalent to 'XSLT as a scripting language' of Moore.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by using XSLT as taught by Moore to have wherein XSLT is employed to translate the information.

For the purpose of using standard information technologies such as XSLT.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16, 17, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Jayaram as set forth above, in view of Koizumi. (U. S. Patent

Publication 20020026633, referred to as **Koizumi**)

Claim 16

Jayaram does not teach presenting to each of a plurality of users.

Koizumi teaches presenting to each of a plurality of users. (**Koizumi,**

¶0380; 'Plurality of users' of applicant is disclosed by the delivery of the object

program to the users of Koizumi.) It would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings

of Jayaram by having multiple users as taught by Koizumi to present to each of a

plurality of users.

For the purpose of having more than one person to use the software.

Jayaram teaches plurality of options for translating an element of the

information. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47; 'Plurality of options' of applicant is equivalent

to 'commands' of Jayaram.)

Claim 17

Jayaram does not teach presenting to each of a plurality of users.

Koizumi teaches presenting to each of a plurality of users. (**Koizumi,**

¶0380; 'Plurality of users' of applicant is disclosed by the delivery of the object

program to the users of Koizumi.) It would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings

of Jayaram by having more than one user as taught by Koizumi to present to

each of a plurality of users.

For the purpose of having more than one person to use the software.

Jayaram teaches a plurality of options for translating an element of the

information, the plurality of options and the information element differing for each

of the plurality of users. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47, abstract; 'Presenting a plurality of

options of applicant is equivalent to 'constructs in a selectable list' of Jayaram.

'Translating an element' of applicant is disclosed by the 'database conversion

engine' of Jayaram.))

Claim 34

Jayaram does not teach wherein a pattern matching rule from the first

plurality of pattern matching rules is based on a plurality of knowledge elements

and at least one known relationship between the plurality of knowledge elements,

each of the plurality of knowledge elements identifiable as an entity in the

information.

Koizumi teaches wherein a pattern matching rule from the first plurality of

pattern matching rules is based on a plurality of knowledge elements and at least

one known relationship between the plurality of knowledge elements, each of the

plurality of knowledge elements identifiable as an entity in the information.

(**Koizumi;** ¶0054; 'Pattern matching rule' of applicant is equivalent to 'translation

rules' of Koizumu. 'Knowledge elements' and 'known relationship' of applicant is

illustrated by the function of the ARM (abstract register machine) of Koizumu.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by using rules based on knowledge elements as taught by Koizumi to a pattern matching rule from the first plurality of pattern matching rules is based on a plurality of knowledge elements and at least one known relationship between the plurality of knowledge elements, each of the plurality of knowledge elements identifiable as an entity in the information.

For the purpose of using rules that follow elements and there relationship between them.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21, 28-33, 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Jayaram as set forth above, in view of Nixon. (U. S. Patent

Publication 20020077711, referred to as **Nixon**)

Claim 21

Jayaram does not teach receiving input from each of a plurality of users

regarding each user's preference for translating an element of the information.

Nixon teaches receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding

each user's preference for translating an element of the information. (**Nixon,**

¶0048; 'Plurality of users' of Nixon is equivalent to 'one or more users' of Nixon.)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time

of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by being to input

information from a plurality of users as taught by Nixon to receive input from each

of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference for translating an element

of the information.

For the purpose of the invention being flexible with multiple user's inputs.

Claim 28

Jayaram does not teach providing a view of the destination system.

Nixon teaches comprising providing a view of the destination system.

(**Nixon,** ¶0125; 'Providing a view' of applicant is equivalent to 'graphical views' of

Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by providing

output as taught by Nixon to have a view of the destination system.

For the purpose of see the interface of the system.

Claim 29

Jayaram does not teach providing a plurality of differing views of the

destination system, each of the plurality of differing views corresponding to a

different use for the destination system.

Nixon teaches providing a plurality of differing views of the destination

system, each of the plurality of differing views corresponding to a different use for

the destination system. (**Nixon,** ¶0125; 'Plurality of differing views' of applicant is

equivalent to 'one or more pull down menus' of Nixon.) It would have been

obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's

invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by providing multiple views as

taught by Nixon to have a plurality of differing views of the destination system,

each of the plurality of differing views corresponding to a different use for the

destination system.

For the purpose of each user having their own view if required.

Claim 30 .

Jayaram does not teach presenting in the graphical user interface the

information and the second transformed version.

Nixon teaches presenting in the graphical user interface the information and the second transformed version. (**Nixon,** ¶0125, ¶0048; 'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'GUI' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by using GUI interface as taught by Nixon to have in the graphical user interface the information and the second transformed version.

For the purpose of ease of use for the user.

Claim 31

Jayaram does not teach presenting in the graphical user interface the information and the second transformed version, a change in the user input reflected in the second transformed version.

Nixon teaches presenting in the graphical user interface the information and the second transformed version, a change in the user input reflected in the second transformed version. (**Nixon,** ¶0048; 'Second transformed version' of applicant can be seen as the 'different types of information' of a user.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by being able to alter the interface as taught by Nixon to present in the graphical user interface the information and the second transformed version, a change in the user input reflected in the second transformed version.

For the purpose of altering the interface if needed or required by the user.

Claim 32

Jayaram does not teach wherein the second transformed version is based

on the first transformed version.

Nixon teaches wherein the second transformed version is based on the

first transformed version. (**Nixon,** ¶0088; 'Second transformed version based on

the first' of applicant can be seen as the 'hierarchy represents' of a user.) It would

have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by altering an existing

interface as taught by Nixon to have the second transformed version is based on

the first transformed version.

For the purpose of updating an interface fir greater or lesser content.

Claim 33

Jayaram does not teach wherein the second transformed version is not

based on the first transformed version.

Nixon teaches wherein the second transformed version is not based on

the first transformed version. (**Nixon,** ¶0048; 'Not based on the first transform' of

applicant is equivalent to 'different sets' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to

a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

modify the teachings of Jayaram by generating a new interface as taught by

Nixon to have the second transformed version is not based on the first

transformed version.

For the purpose of looking at a completely different interface if needed.

Claim 36

Jayaram does not teach wherein at least one of the first plurality of

patterns is a set.

Nixon teaches wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a set.

(**Nixon,** ¶0048; 'Patterns is a set' of applicant is disclosed by 'different sets' of

Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by having

information in a set as taught by Nixon to have at least one of the first plurality of

patterns is a set.

For the purpose of easing the search of information.

Claim 37

Jayaram does not teach wherein at least one of the first plurality of

patterns is a hierarchy.

Nixon teaches wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a

hierarchy. (**Nixon,** ¶0088; 'Patterns is a hierarchy' of applicant can be seen as

the 'hierarchy represents' of a user.) It would have been obvious to a person

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the

teachings of Jayaram by having a hierarchy structure in patterns as taught by

Nixon to have wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a hierarchy.

For the purpose of looking at patterns related in a processing structure.

Claim 38

Jayaram does not teach wherein at least one of the first plurality of

patterns is a naming convention.

Nixon teaches wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a

naming convention. (**Nixon,** Fig. 8; "naming convention' of applicant is illustrated

by the examples of 'Mixing-reagent1', 'Mixer-in1', 'Mixer-reagent2', 'Mixer-in2',

'Mixer-feed', 'Mixer-in', "Static mixer' and 'Mixer-out' of Nixon.) It would have

been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's

invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by using naming conventions as

taught by Nixon to have at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a naming

convention.

For the purpose of ease of search based on the name of patterns.

Claim 39

Jayaram does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from

a first user and input from a second user.

Nixon teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user

and input from a second user. (**Nixon,** ¶0048; Nixon discloses that one or more

users can subscribe to the same or different sets of data.) It would have been

obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's

invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by having multiple users work on

each other's input as taught by Nixon to have wherein the user input is derived

from input from a first user and input from a second user.

For the purpose of being to modify each other work for improved results.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
> disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the
> prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not
> be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Jayaram as set forth above, in view the combination of Koizumi and Betawar. (U.

S. Patent Publication 20020026633, referred to as **Koizumi**; U. S. Patent

Publication 20020055804, referred to as **Betawar**)

Claim 22

Jayaram does not teach receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference for translating an element of the information, a first user's preference overriding a second user's preference.

Koizumi teaches receiving input from each of a plurality of users (**Koizumi,** ¶0380; 'Plurality of users' of applicant is disclosed by the delivery of the object program to the users of Koizumi.) Betawat teaches regarding each user's preference for translating an element of the information, a first user's preference overriding a second user's preference. (**Betawar,** ¶0057; In this example, 'First user' of applicant is equivalent to 'engineering supervisors of Betawar. Second user of applicant is equivalent to 'lower level line engineers'.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by having multiple users in which one user can override another input as taught by Koizumi and Betawar to receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference for translating an element of the information, a first user's preference overriding a second user's preference.

For the purpose of having more than one person being able to override a preference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the
prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not
be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Jayaram as set forth above, in view Betawar. (U. S. Patent Publication

20020055804, referred to as **Betawar**)

Claim 40

Jayaram does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from

a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different

position in a value chain than the second user.

Betawar teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first

user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in

a value chain than the second user. (**Betawar**, ¶0057; 'First user' of applicant is

equivalent to 'lower level line engineers' of Betawar. 'Input is derived' and 'input

from a second user' of applicant is illustrated by the supervisor being able to edit

parameters.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the

art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by

users having different authority positions as taught by Betawar to wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a value chain than the second user.

For the purpose of having the role of supervisor incorporated within the specification.

Claim 41

Jayaram does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a business process than the second user.

Betawar teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a business process than the second user. (**Betawar, ¶0057**; 'Different position' of applicant is equivalent to the difference 'lower level line engineers' and 'engineering supervisors' of Betawar.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by having users at different authority levels as taught by Betawar to have wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a business process than the second user.

For the purpose of having the role of supervisor incorporated in a business setting within the specification.

Claim 42

Jayaram does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, at least a portion of the input from the second user altering at least a portion of the input from the first user.

Betawar teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, at least a portion of the input from the second user altering at least a portion of the input from the first user. (**Betawar,** ¶0057; 'First user' of applicant is equivalent to 'lower level line engineers' of Betawar. 'Input is derived' and 'input from a second user' of applicant is illustrated by the supervisor being able to edit parameters.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jayaram by having the supervisor being able to alter input of another user as taught by Betawar to have wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, at least a portion of the input from the second user altering at least a portion of the input from the first user.

For the purpose of the supervisor making changes on lower level users input.

Conclusion

4.   The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

Model and Control and translation

-U. S. Patent 6341372: Datig   6/16/1997

| -U. S. Patent 6112126: Hales | 2/20/1998 |

Interface and Preference and "Expert system"

-U. S. Patent 6421571: Spriggs	2/29/2000
-U. S. Patent Publication 20020103695: Urken	6/9/1999
-U. S. Patent Publication 20020073088: Beckmann	9/4/2001
-U. S. Patent Publication 20020069134: Solomon	12/3/2001
-U. S. Patent Publication 20020035501: Handel	11/19/1998

5.   Claims 1-45 are rejected.

Correspondence Information

6.   Any inquiry concerning this information or related to the subject disclosure
should be directed to the Examiner Peter Coughlan, whose telephone number is
(571) 272-5990. The Examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from
7:15 a.m. to 3:45 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the
Examiner's supervisor David Vincent can be reached at (571) 272-3080. Any
response to this office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,

Washington, D. C. 20231;

Hand delivered to:

Receptionist,

Customer Service Window,

Randolph Building,

401 Dulany Street,

Alexandria, Virginia 22313,

(located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building);

or faxed to:

(571) 272-3150 (for formal communications intended for entry.)

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have any questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

Peter Coughlan

7/18/2007

DAVID VINCENT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
7/19/07